

The Examiner alleges that the products of claims 5 and 10 can be made by a materially different process, e.g., by forming the required coil pattern by deposition and coating techniques, e.g., plating, CVD, etc. as opposed to cutting or punching of conductive material as required by the process claims 1-4 and 6-9. This allegation is respectfully traversed.

Clearly the product that results from cutting or punching of conductive materials as required by process claims 1-4 and 6-9 is discernibly different from a coil created by different processes such as those suggested by the Examiner. For example, relatively sharp sheared edges of the coil pattern would result from practicing applicant's claimed process whereas the deposition and coating techniques suggested by the Examiner would not have such edge surfaces. Accordingly, the product as claimed (i.e., as manufactured by the methodology of a parent claim) cannot be made by a materially different process (e.g., by a deposition and/or coating technique which produces a discernibly different resulting coil structure as evidenced, for example, by the edges of the conductive traces).

Accordingly, it is not believed that the Examiner has met the required burden of demonstrating that the product as claimed can be made by another materially different process.

In order to fully respond to the outstanding Office Action, applicant provisionally elects the allegedly patentably distinct invention II comprising claims 1-4 and 6-9.

In addition, the Examiner has alleged that invention II comprises three patentably distinct species (i.e., no one of which is made "obvious" in view of any other or combination of others under 35 U.S.C. §103). In particular, the Examiner alleges that claims 7, 8 and 9 are each patentably distinct one from the other. Accordingly, again to be fully responsive, applicant hereby further provisionally elects the patentably distinct species of claim 7. In this regard, it is